UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
WILSON GALARZA,	
Plaintiff,	
-against-	19-cv-10898 (LAK)
CITY OF NEW YORK, et al.,	
Defendants.	USDC SDNY DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED
ORDER	DOC #:

LEWIS A. KAPLAN, District Judge.

The matter is before the Court on motions *in limine* by each side seeking evidentiary rulings with respect to trial evidence and argments. The Court rules as follows:

Plaintiff's Motion (Dkt 192)

The relief sought in paragraphs 1 through 4 and 7 is granted without opposition.

The relief sought in paragraph 5 is denied as premature. The question of whether the jury should be instructed with respect to nominal damages would be raised more appropriately at the close of the evidence.

The relief sought in paragraph 6 is denied. See, e.g., Lightfoot v. Union Carbide Corp., 110 F.3d 898, 912 (2d Cir. 1997), Consorti v. Armstrong World Industries, Inc., 72 F.3d 1003, 1016 (2d Cir. 1995), vacated on other grounds, 518 U.S. 1031(1996). This Court exercises its discretion to preclude such argument.

Defendants' Motion (Dkt 189)

The relief sought in Points I, II, IV, VI, and VII is granted without opposition.

The relief sought in Point III is granted. Nor shall plaintiff refer to defense counsel as assistant corporation counsel or otherwise indicate that they are counsel to the City or members of the City Law Department.

The relief sought in Point V is granted in light of plaintiff's response that he does not intend to go into the issue of training and his withdrawal of PX 39-41.

The relief sought in Point VIII is denied without prejudice to renewal at trial.

The relief sought in Point IX is moot as to PX 32. PX 31 and 33, if appropriate for such a purpose, may be used for impeachment but not otherwise.

Conclusion

The Clerk shall terminate Dkt 189 and 192.

SO ORDERED.

Dated:

May 16, 2025

United States District Judge

The relief sought is specified in defendants' memorandum in support of the motion. See Dkt 190.